



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &  
ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE CT 06468

**COPY MAILED** Paper No.

NOV 02 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Hytinen et al. :  
Application No. 10/749,872 : DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION  
Filed: December 31, 2003 : PURSUANT TO  
Attorney Docket No.: 915- : 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(A)  
008.018 :  
Title: LOG SYSTEM FOR CALENDAR :  
ALARMS :

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed October 5, 2009, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a), requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

This renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) is **DISMISSED**.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the notice of non-compliant amendment, mailed April 16, 2008, which set a period for reply of one month. No response was received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on May 17, 2008. A notice of abandonment was mailed on June 8, 2009.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE C.F.R. AND MPEP

37 C.F.R. § 1.134 sets forth, *in toto*:

An Office action will notify the applicant of any non-statutory or shortened statutory time period set for reply to an Office action. Unless the applicant is notified in writing that a reply is required in less than six months, a maximum period of six months is allowed.

37 C.F.R. § 1.135 sets forth, *in toto*:

(a) If an applicant of a patent application fails to reply within the time period provided under § 1.134 and § 1.136, the application will become abandoned unless an Office action indicates otherwise.

(b) Prosecution of an application to save it from abandonment pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section must include such complete and proper reply as the condition of the application may require. The admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after final rejection or any amendment not responsive to the last action, or any related proceedings, will not operate to save the application from abandonment.

(c) When reply by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, and is substantially a complete reply to the non-final Office action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, applicant may be given a new time period for reply under § 1.134 to supply the omission.

Section 711.03(c) (I) (A) of the MPEP sets forth, *in toto*:

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee ( 35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute ( 35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. **The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable.** It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the

practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

(Emphasis added).

#### PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND ANALYSIS

An original petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) was filed on July 24, 2009, where Practitioner indicated that the notice of non-compliant amendment was not received at the correspondence address of record,<sup>1</sup> and that a search of the "files" indicates the same.<sup>2</sup> Petitioner further included a copy of both the mail log and the master docket for the relevant time period. The original petition was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on September 1, 2009.

---

<sup>1</sup> Original Petition, page 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

With this renewed petition, Petitioner has included, *inter alia*, copies of daily mail lists (which are distributed to each practitioner for his/her review), and a description of the system used for recording an Office communication received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. Petitioner indicated that all mail received from the Office is entered onto a daily mail list, and all communications that carry a period for response are entered into "the electronic docketing system." Moreover, due dates are placed on the front of the application file wrappers, and docket entries appear "in the printed docket for each individual practitioner."<sup>3</sup>

However, the record does not support a finding that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable, as the petition is silent as to how this docketing system serves to ensure that the correspondence recorded therein is responded to in a timely manner. **On second renewed petition, Petitioner should:**

- **indicate whether the electronic docketing system generates the above-mentioned printed dockets;**
- **indicate the frequency at which these printed dockets are generated (i.e., are they printed on a weekly basis?) ;**
- **indicate whether these printed dockets are distributed to each practitioner for his/her review, and;**
- **provide a copy of the printed docket(s) for the relevant practitioner during the relevant timeframe, to show that the notice of non-compliant amendment of April 16, 2008 does not appear thereon.**

#### CONCLUSION

The time period for filing a renewed petition is governed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(f). Therefore, if reconsideration of this decision is desired, any response to this decision must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision, and **extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are not permitted.** The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a)". This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C § 704.

The renewed petition should indicate in a prominent manner that the attorney handling this matter is Paul Shanoski, and may be submitted by mail,<sup>4</sup> hand-delivery,<sup>5</sup> or facsimile.<sup>6</sup> Registered

---

3 Renewed petition, page 3.

4 Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

5 Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

users of EFS-Web may alternatively submit a response to this decision via EFS-Web.<sup>7</sup>

If responding by mail, Petitioner is advised not to place the undersigned's name on the envelope. Only the information that appears in the footnote should be included - adding anything else to the address will delay the delivery of the response to the undersigned.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures should be directed to the Technology Center.

Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any of Petitioner's further action(s).

/Paul Shanoski/  
Paul Shanoski  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

6 (571) 273-8300- please note this is a central facsimile number.

7 <https://sportal.uspto.gov/authenticate/authenticateuserlocalepf.html>